

Application No. 10/614,148

Reply to Office Action

REMARKS*Summary of the Application*

Claims 8-31 are currently pending.

Amendments to the Claims

Of the claims that are currently pending, claims 8-13 are amended, claims 14 and 15 retain their original language as filed, and claims 16-31 are new.

Support for the amendments to claims 8-13 may be found in the claims and specification as originally filed, for example, at page 3, lines 27-33 and at page 3, line 42 through page 4, line 4.

Support for new claims 16 and 18 also may be found in the claims and specification as originally filed, for example, at page 7, line 37 through page 8, line 4. Claims 17, 19, 20 and 21 also are added, and correspond to existing claims 9, 10, 12 and 13, respectively.

Claims 22 and 24, newly introduced, are supported by the claims and specification as originally filed, for example, at page 13, lines 13-20. Claims 23, 25, 26 and 27 also are added, and correspond to claims 9, 10, 12 and 13, respectively.

Support for new claims 28 and 29 may be found in the claims and specification as originally filed, for example, at page 9, lines 6-18. New claims 30 and 31 also may be found in the claims and specification as originally filed, for example, at page 7, lines 28-33 and the Invention Examples.

No new matter has been added to the application by way of these amendments.

Summary of the Office Action

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as allegedly lacking a sufficient antecedent basis for the limitation in the claim.

Claims 8-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,944,496 (Van Haare et al.).

Application No. 10/614,148

Reply to Office Action

Claims 8-15 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over copending Application No. 10/105,758.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as lacking antecedent basis. In response, Applicants have amended claim 10 in a manner that overcomes the rejection. As a consequence, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Section 112 rejection.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Van Haare et al.

Claims 8 and 11 are directed to processes for producing electroluminescent devices. The process steps of claim 8 include, among other limitations relevant to patentability, coating said layer comprising an electroluminescent phosphor with a dielectric layer, and coating said dielectric layer with a solution, dispersion or paste comprising a polymer or copolymer of a 3,4-dialkoxythiophene to produce said second conductive layer. The process steps of claim 11 include, among other limitations relevant to patentability, coating said second conductive layer with a dielectric layer and coating said dielectric layer with a layer comprising an electroluminescent phosphor.

In marked contrast, Van Haare et al. fails to disclose the inclusion of a dielectric layer. Moreover, there is no teaching set forth in Van Haare et al. that would motivate one skilled in the art to include such a layer.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that rejection of claims 8-11 be withdrawn.

Rejection under the Judicially Created Doctrine of Obviousness Type Double Patenting

Claims 8-15 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 6, 10 and 13 of copending Application

Application No. 10/614,148

Reply to Office Action

No. 10/105,758. In response, Applicants submit herewith a terminal disclaimer pursuant to 37 CFR 1.321, and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Conclusion

The application is considered in good and proper form for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher T. Griffith, Reg. No. 33,392
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6780
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: November 14, 2005